

Petri	Bentorum	Stump
Pombo	Barton	Sundquist
Porter	Schaefer	Talent
Portman	Schiff	Taylor (MS)
Pyros (OH)	Schroeder	Taylor (NO)
Quillen	Sensenbrenner	Thomas (CA)
Quins	Shaw	Thomas (WY)
Ramstad	Shays	Torkildsen
Regula	Shuster	Upton
Ridge	Skeen	Vucanovich
Roberts	Smith (MD)	Walker
Rogers	Smith (OR)	Walsh
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)	Weldon
Roe-Lehman	Snowe	Wolf
Roth	Solomon	Young (AK)
Roarkema	Spence	Young (FL)
Royce	Stearns	Zimmer

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Dickey Zellig

## NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis	Istook	Thompson
Brown (CA)	Johnston	Tucker
Coeyers	Klug	Valentine
Ford (TN)	Kopetski	Whitten
Galleghy	Leach	Williams
Gingrich	McMillan	Wise
Henry	Miller (FL)	
Houghton	Sanders	

□ 1123

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). Will the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. DELAURO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 775. An act to modify the requirements applicable to locatable minerals on public lands, consistent with the principles of self-initiation of mining claims, and for other purposes.

## REMOVAL OF NAME AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 436

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 436.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McDERMOTT). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BARCA] who has been elected to fill the vacant First District seat, be allowed to take the oath of office, notwithstanding the fact that a certificate of election for him has not arrived? The Republican candidate has conceded and, to my knowledge, there is no objection to Mr. BARCA taking the oath of office from this side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would have to take that under advisement with the Speaker of the House.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would like to announce that there will be 15 1-minutes on each side.

## ITS TIME FOR ACTION

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, this is a critical week—a week that gives Members of the House the opportunity to show that we have some courage—the courage to match our rhetoric about deficit reduction with action.

Tomorrow, we vote on the largest deficit reduction package in our national history. It is a measure that will reverse a 12-year legacy of deficit spending, trickle-down economics, and neglect—and instead, help put us on a course of fiscal restraint, tax fairness, and economic growth.

In a bill this large and this comprehensive, it is easy to find some measures that you do not like. It is also easy to succumb to the pressures of interest groups that want to stick with business-as-usual.

But too much is at stake here. This is a choice between narrow interests and the national interest. It is a choice between the status quo and change—between stagnation and growth—between fiscal discipline and fiscal default.

Sweeping change cannot be accomplished without tough choices. And no measure that is going to be effective is going to please everyone.

We must rise above parochial concerns—to remember that for every orchestrated phone call we have gotten from a special interest opposing this or that, there are thousands silently praying that we will take action to bring about real change.

This bill is not pain-free—but real disaster awaits if we let our Government and our economy continue to drift. We must have the courage to join together for action in the national interest—to support the President and vote for a new direction for the country.

## TAX FAIRNESS LACKING FOR SENIORS

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow Congress will consider the largest tax increase in history. Every family in the United States can expect to pay more. But one segment of society will have an additional tax burden. I am referring to the increased Social Security tax President Clinton has proposed for seniors.

This tax increase would hit seniors hard, bringing their tax rates up to a real rate of 70 percent. But that is not all. When combined with the Social Security earnings penalty, the marginal tax rate on these seniors can reach 103 percent. This would actually exceed the amount of money they receive in benefits. The Government would take back every penny these seniors receive in Social Security benefits and more.

President Clinton stated in "Putting People First" that he wanted to "lift the Social Security earning test limit so that Older Americans are able to help rebuild our economy and create a better future for all." He said he would bring tax relief to seniors.

Instead of considering new taxes on seniors tomorrow, we should be lifting the earnings penalty on Social Security and allowing seniors to work and be productive—thereby creating real tax fairness.

□ 1130

## URGING SUPPORT FOR A RESPONSIBLE BUDGET PLAN

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, this week we have a chance to make an investment in the future when we consider the President's budget plan. The President's budget plan is a good one. It reduces the deficit by almost \$500 million over the next 5 years. It is historic in that respect. It cuts spending and restores fairness to the Tax Code. It asks those who are most well off to pay their fair share of taxes. Working middle-class families will not see an increase in their income taxes.

I do not minimize the contribution everyone will make to the energy tax, but three-quarters of the taxes will be paid by the wealthiest 6 percent of this country. The President's plan makes Government accountable for its spending with the establishment of the deficit trust fund.

President Clinton's budget plan is responsible and long overdue. He is not responsible for the huge deficit that he inherited, a deficit that increased from \$79 billion in 1981 to \$290 billion at the end of the Bush administration. He is not responsible for this deficit, but he is responsible for our future. He has taken this challenge seriously and

given us a plan that will reduce the deficit, cut spending, and transfer the tax burden to those who can most afford it.

The President's plan deserves our support. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

#### LET US HAVE AN OPEN RULE ON THE CLINTON TAX AND SPEND BILL

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, the Democrat leadership barred the doors to the Ways and Means Committee so that the American people could not watch as they crafted legislation for the largest tax increase in American history.

This week, the Democrat leadership seeks a closed rule on that bill, a rule which will prohibit a vote on the specifics.

It is a terrible way to legislate, Mr. Speaker, and it is an unconscionable way to pick the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Let us have an open rule on this bill. If Members want to vote for an energy tax which will put the squeeze on each and every American family, let them vote for it in the open. If Members want to vote for a tax increase on Social Security recipients, let them vote for it, but let us do it for the record, and let the chips fall where they may.

#### URGING MEMBERS TO RISE ABOVE SPECIAL INTEREST POLITICS AND SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in the next day the American people will tune in to the House of Representatives like they did on the Persian Gulf war vote. The stakes are very high for this institution, because once again, the American people will be asking if we can govern. Can the Democrats stay united and lead instead of dividing themselves? Can the Republicans rise above partisanship and obstructionism? Most importantly, can President Clinton run this country as he was elected to do, rather than gridlock taking over once again?

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton deserves a chance. Ross Perot's budget is 85 percent similar to the President's, yet he now denounces it. The President's package is the only game in town. It is a good and fair plan, yet every lobby in every region wants a last-minute fix.

That is understandable, but let us rise above personal and political interests and give this young Presidency a chance.

#### CLINTON'S TAX BILL ASKS TOO MUCH OF AMERICANS

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has broken his tax-cut covenant with middle class America. And unfortunately, the sacrament of reconciliation, or in this case, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, will do very little to ease his guilty conscience.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act reads like a grocery list of Clinton inspired sins against the American taxpayer. The most mortal of which is a \$70 billion Btu tax which will ask the average American family of four, to sacrifice an additional \$471 a year in higher energy prices. It will also separate 600,000 to a million people from their jobs when their factories are forced to move overseas.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress must be allowed to strike egregious items like the Btu tax from the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act, because, simply put, President Clinton has threatened to pass the basket once to often and it is time to put an end to his bottomless Government coffer.

#### THE BEST BUDGET PLAN

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there are only two plans for reconciliation on the table. The Boren plan wants to cut Social Security COLA's. The Boren plan wants to cut Medicare. That is a plan I cannot accept.

There is a lot of pain in the reconciliation package, and we are willing to accept some of that pain, but the President's package at least lays a firm foundation on which we can move forward. After this foundation is laid, we will have our opportunity to make further cuts.

I am all for cutting the CIA budget, I am all for cutting the super collider, I am all for cutting obsolete weapons systems. We will have our opportunity to do that when we deal with the appropriations, but the firm foundation must be laid first and the President's reconciliation package is that firm foundation.

In order for us to break the gridlock and for us to go forward, we must support this package, and we must do it now. The only other alternative says cut Social Security and cut Medicare. We will not cut Social Security and cut Medicare.

#### THE IMPACT OF THE BTU TAX ON THE ECONOMY

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the impact of the Btu tax on the economy. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will not vote for the rule on reconciliation unless it allows a separate vote on the Btu tax.

President Clinton campaigned as the champion of the middle class and as the candidate to fix the economy, but his regressive Btu tax on energy would hit the middle class hard and wreck the economy. We all know the Btu tax will raise gasoline by 8 cents, will cost the average family \$500, will have many indirect costs, and will create or will cost us 400,000 to 500,000 jobs.

However, to add insult to injury, the Btu tax will be adjusted for inflation, which means the tax will increase and continue to grow each year ahead. I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule on reconciliation, unless it allows a separate vote on the Btu tax.

#### RECONCILIATION BILL PUTS AMERICA FIRST

(Mr. BLACKWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, diversion is a military tactic, designed to distract and derail, and thereby weaken those who would move forward.

Despite the partisan maneuver which killed a sound economic stimulus package, President Clinton has an economic recovery program to repair the past, stabilize the present, and project America into the future.

When we vote on the reconciliation bill tomorrow, we will be supporting real deficit reduction, a restoration of tax fairness, three for one spending cuts, and solid investment in America.

There are some who seek to divert the attention of the President and the Congress away from the economy. They seek to distract the American people, and thereby derail the movement to return some of the wealth of this Nation to the poor and middle class.

If we support the President, in 5 years, we will reduce the deficit by nearly \$500 billion, we will put Americans back to work, at livable wages, and we will place the economy on firm footing for the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the reconciliation bill. We should not be duped by those who put party, politics, and special interests above the wellbeing of America.

#### PLUCKED BY THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year we heard Bill Clinton talk a lot about jobs. We all assumed he

meant that he was going to increase jobs. But we were wrong. His defense cuts are going to cost 400,000 jobs and his energy tax is going to cost Americans 600,000 jobs.

Just those two parts of his budget are going to cost Americans a total of 1 million jobs. We get more job cuts than spending cuts.

But cutting a million jobs is not enough. President Clinton wants to pile on the largest tax hike in history. Under his own optimistic projections, it is only going to reduce the deficit \$40 billion—from \$290 billion to \$250 billion—during the next 4 years and after that it goes up again. Yet Bill Clinton attracted votes by promising to cut the deficit in half.

What happened to the Bill Clinton we all heard and saw just a few months ago?

Spending cuts have turned into haircuts. No taxes has turned into new taxes. Job creation has turned into job evaporation. The deficit isn't cut in half. And voters are feeling like a chick'n, plucked by President Clinton.

□ 1140

#### THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EQUAL PAY ACT

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce a joint resolution designating the week of June 7, 1993, "Equal Pay Act 30th Anniversary Week."

This landmark act called our country to the standard of equality it was founded upon and required equal pay for equal work for men and women.

However, we must also note how far we still have to go toward fairness and equality. Women and people of color continue to be undervalued and underpaid for the skills, effort, and responsibility required by the work that they do.

This resolution reminds us that, although the Equal Pay Act was an important step in the right direction, we must not forget that wage discrimination persists in the 1990's, paying women and people of color mere fractions of the salaries earned by their white male counterparts.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S VIEW OF SACRIFICE

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker—  
There once was a barber Christophe  
Who snipped at the hair of the boss  
All the planes they delayed  
Left many travellers dismayed  
Why not a 10-buck cut like Ross?

All kidding aside, Mr. Speaker, this President certainly has a strange view of sacrifice. With him sacrifice is all a

one-way street. The taxpayers do all the sacrificing while the Government gets a free ride.

And the more I think about it, the more the President's \$200 haircut looks like an apt metaphor for the entire Clinton Presidency. As with the budget, the good of the Government was put ahead of the good of those who pay the bills.

So when the President talks about Government sacrifice, America, don't believe it. Under President Clinton Government spending will increase \$300 billion and the national debt will increase by over \$1 trillion.

Meanwhile, you will be asked to pay over \$300 billion in higher income taxes, higher corporate taxes, and a new energy tax.

But I have an idea for raising revenue that I think the President might go for. How about a tax on all haircuts costing over \$20?

#### SUPPORT OF THE BUDGET RECONCILIATION PACKAGE

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong support for the President's budget reconciliation measure which we will vote on tomorrow.

There are many reasons for my support of this measure:

The deficit reduction trust fund which locks in \$500 billion in reductions over the next 5 years.

The Mickey Leland Child Hunger Prevention Act.

The Family Preservation Act.

But one of the most attractive elements in this budget is the increase in the earned income tax credit to \$30,000 per year.

Working families with two or more children, earning only minimum wage, would receive a wage supplement of nearly \$3,400.

Families of four with a full-time worker would be assured of being lifted to the poverty line if they also received food stamps.

In the Sixth Congressional District of South Carolina, which I am privileged to represent, 80 percent of the working families earn less than \$30,000 per year.

Mr. Speaker, the earned income tax credit allows those families to earn more money for everyday necessities, and to reap greater benefits for their hard work.

#### NEGATIVE IMPACT OF PRESIDENT'S PACKAGE

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that an administration which rode into Washington promising to create jobs and reduce taxes on the middle class is working so hard to pass a middle-class tax

hike and reduce jobs to the middle class.

I think the Btu tax is a bad idea for the country. But Mr. Speaker, it is the rural areas like my State of Wyoming that are going to be hit especially hard.

For example, we drive long distances, and families in Wyoming are reckoned to be hit by about \$1,100 in taxes as opposed to the \$500 or \$600 as an average throughout the country. Cattle producers, \$12 to \$15 a head on the taxes that are being proposed here. On coal, \$4 a ton for low-sulfur coal, the kind of coal we ought to be using for the environment of this country, the Btu tax doubles that cost to 8 bucks. We are trying to reduce the imports of oil, and what does this do? Much of the oil in Wyoming comes from stripper wells, 15 barrels or less. The largest cost for them is electric power to pump this oil. We will be increasing foreign oil.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad idea. Mr. Clinton has promised to put a laser on the economy. In fact, he has put his tax gun on the middle-class jobs and middle-class taxes.

#### SUPPORT FOR RECONCILIATION PACKAGE

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of President Clinton's budget reconciliation package which we will be voting on tomorrow. Let me be clear: There are things about this package that I do not like—particularly the impact of the Btu and the Social Security provisions. But the fact remains that no one on this planet could develop a proposal that would both satisfy everyone and make a true, honest attempt at deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, for the last 12 years, Republicans and Democrats have fought over how to reduce the deficit. Well, this reconciliation bill truly reduces the deficit.

And I would point out to my colleagues that passing this budget does not limit the amount of deficit reduction we can do. If we feel the plan does not go far enough, we can do more through the appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, I was sent to Congress to do some things, to reduce the deficit, to fund investments, to cut unnecessary spending and to support families. That is why I am supporting this budget.

#### FARMERS HAVE PAID THEIR FAIR SHARE

(Mr. COMBEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, recently visiting with a group of farmers in my district, and getting the dismal reports of many very reputable groups around this country on the impact President

Clinton's budget would have on American agriculture, I asked those farmers to send in specifics from their farm. Several of them have responded to that.

This chart shows a specific farm in west Texas. It would be very average. It raises cotton, milo, and wheat. I want to focus just for 1 minute on just the deficiency payments alone and the implications it would have on that farm. The red line would show the point at which the farmer would have a negative net worth on his farm without deficiency payments. The black line is the true implications of what would happen on that farm with deficiency payments. As we can readily see, in 1981 that farmer's net worth would have fallen below the zero-level line.

Farmers have done their part in dealing with the deficit problems, Mr. Speaker. And we are looking not just at farmers competing with farmers across the turn row but the farmer around the world. Consequently, all of those implications that foreign countries have on their deficiency payments and upon their increasing their agricultural output has tremendous implications on the American farmer.

Agriculture has done its part, Mr. Speaker.

#### URGING SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLAN

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives has the opportunity to set this country on a course that will both invest in our future and reduce the mammoth Federal deficit. After 12 years of Presidents running up huge deficits and spending money wastefully, President Clinton has provided us with a bold plan to cut spending, restore tax fairness, and invest rather than waste our precious tax dollars.

President Clinton could have followed the lead of his predecessors and ignored the deficit. He could have presented another economic plan that said "let us live for today and do not worry about tomorrow." But the President knows that the deficit is more like termites in the basement than a wolf behind the door. It is eating away at our country's prosperity and placing the gigantic deficit squarely on the backs of our children.

The President's plan is fair because it cuts spending and places the burden of new taxes on those who are most able to pay them; 73 percent of the tax increases fall on the top 5 percent of taxpayers.

With the President's plan, we have a choice: go with the status quo that threatens our country's future or take bold action to change our direction for the better. I hope you will join me in supporting the President's efforts to set this country on a course of deficit

reduction, investment, and economic prosperity.

#### TRUE COST TO TAXPAYERS OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S PLAN

(Mr. KIM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I want the American public to know that the new budget really is the largest tax increase in American history.

It will cost American taxpayers \$332 billion over the next 5 years.

As an engineer, I always like to quantify figures.

Using basic math, let us see how much this tax hike will really mean to an average American family.

Take \$332 billion and divide it by 435 congressional districts. That is \$760 million per district.

Now, divide \$760 million by the number of people in each district, roughly 570,000, and the result is shocking. A family of five will pay \$7,000 in new tax increases.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve the truth, I repeat, this tax bill is going to cost the average family of five nearly \$7,000 in new taxes.

It is simple mathematics and it is outrageous.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this outrageous tax increase.

□ 1150

#### SOME ANSWERS ABOUT THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

(Ms. BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, over the last few weeks, there has been a lot of misinformation put forth to the American people by Republicans about the President's budget plan. These politicians have join forces to undermine our President.

Today I am going to provide the American people with the answers to all of their questions about the President's plan. But first let us start with a little history.

Question: What did the Republicans do during the Reagan and Bush administrations in the 1980's?

Answer: Well, they just quadrupled the national deficit, and gave the rich enough tax breaks so that they could party their way through the 1980's.

Question: Does the President's plan turn around the trickle-down economics of the Reagan and Bush years by putting forth a deficit reduction plan that is as fair as it is real in bringing down the deficit?

Answer: Yes, it does.

Question: Does the budget plan include tough cuts to support not only the largest deficit reduction in history but new investments as well?

Answer: Yes, it does.

Question: For every dollar of new investment, is there a dollar of spending cut to pay for it and two more for deficit reduction?

Answer: Yes, there is.

Question: Will the majority of the taxes fall on the wealthy Americans, those that make over \$100,000?

Answer: Yes, 75 percent of all taxes we raise will fall on the top 5.5 percent of all Americans.

Question: Should the American people get behind our President and support his economic plan?

Answer: Yes, they should.

#### ENERGY TAX: A THREAT TO AMERICAN JOBS

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Tax Foundation released a nationwide study highlighting the impact of President Clinton's energy tax on the economy. This study makes for sober reading as the House is soon to begin its debate on the President's tax and spend reconciliation package.

The Foundation's analysis concluded that the United States will lose close to half a million jobs through 1998. In my own district in central Florida almost 700 people could lose their job through the impact of the energy tax. These job losses would stem from several important factors, including greater expenses for energy-intensive businesses and changes in consumer behavior as a result of higher costs to use that energy.

Instead of driving people out of work and forcing more burdens on small business, the President should be looking for ways to increase jobs and remove Government interference from small businesses.

#### CHARTING A BETTER COURSE FOR OUR COUNTRY'S FUTURE

(Mr. STRICKLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, a father once told his son, "Son, never grow a wishbone where a backbone ought to be."

We have a tendency to want to wish away our problems—wish away the deficit, wish away unemployment, wish away 12 years of failed policies.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, wishing gets us nowhere. I and most of my freshman colleagues were elected to bring about positive change. Our greatest opportunity in over a decade comes tomorrow.

But, in the face of special interest lobbyists who deliberately distort the President's program, and its very real attack on the budget deficit, many of us are realizing change takes real courage. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this body to stand up to the big oil lobby-

ists and tell them to go straight to hell. They have done enough to damage this country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that when it comes time to cast the most important vote of the year tomorrow, those who want to chart a better course for our country's future will turn away from wishful thinking and have backbone to vote "yes."

#### NOVEMBER'S ELECTION WAS NOT A MANDATE FOR TAX INCREASES

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago, one of our Democrat colleagues stood in this well and said that " \* \* \* this week we cast a vote on whether we allow the President to govern as the American people elected him to do."

Let us just think about that for a minute. I think it is fair to say that if the American people had any idea that candidate Bill Clinton was going to propose the largest tax increase in American history almost immediately after taking the oath of office, he would not have been elected in November.

I doubt that those 43 percent of the voters who cast their ballots for Bill Clinton on election day were actually voting for an energy tax which will raise the price on everything from the gas pump to the grocery store.

I doubt that they were voting in favor of increased taxes on Social Security recipients.

I doubt that they were voting for middle-class tax increases, particularly since candidate Clinton was promising middle-class tax cuts.

And I doubt that they were voting to raise tax rates on small business owners and farmers by over a third—from 31 percent to as high as 44 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not whether or not we allow the President to govern. The issue is whether or not we allow President Clinton to raise taxes through the roof.

#### A HISTORIC MOMENT IN OUR ECONOMY

(Mr. MILLER OF California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER OF California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when the House votes tomorrow to pass the President's package, we will engage in a historic moment in the economy of this country, because for the first time the House will assure the American people that we will have real deficit reduction, for the first time we will see the deficit not continue to go up as it has for the last 20 years, but we will see a change of direction in the deficit, and that is real.

Why is that real? Not because the Democrats say so, not because the Republicans say it is not, but because the bond markets in this country and the people who are betting their pension fund money and betting their investment money are betting it is real. That is why we see the lowest interest rates in 20 years.

What does that deficit reduction mean to middle America? It means a chance for first-time home buyers; it means a chance for small business formation. It means a chance to finance your kids' education. It means you may be able to afford a new automobile and put people to work. It means you can refinance your home. It means large businesses can reduce the high debt that they engaged in in the 1980's and put it into productive jobs, manufacturing, and new facilities. That is what this is about, ladies and gentlemen.

It is about the first time to historically change the direction of the deficit of this country and the courage of a President to engage in that change.

The question will be whether or not the Congress has that courage.

#### WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL STAFF FIRING: NOT A TRIVIAL MATTER

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I saw on the TV news your comments describing the commentary regarding the White House firing of its travel staff as a distraction.

The connotation is, of course, that undue preoccupation with this subject, with a little politics mixed in, takes away from the importance of the debate over the President's economic package.

And that is true. Except of course, if you are the seven longtime non-political employees involved who now have been fired—rehired maybe—and have had their reputations and careers permanently damaged. Except of course, if you are Attorney General Reno who has found out the White House does not define police matters as coming under the jurisdiction of the Justice Department. Except of course, for those who think there has been misuse of the FBI and now even the Internal Revenue Service as a coverup for passing out the patronage travel business behind closed doors.

Yes, the fate of seven White House employees is pretty small potatoes compared to the national budget. Except for that individual it's 100 percent and it should be 100 percent for every Federal worker and every American citizen worried about Big Brother. I know it is 100 percent for one of the employees: he is my neighbor of many years and a finer professional and more dedicated employee you cannot find.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a trivial matter. Let us get to the bottom of it

with candor, decency, and integrity and yes, Mr. President, with some sense of responsibility.

#### BUY AMERICAN AND SOLVE THE DEFICIT

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, BART [the Bay Area Rapid Transit Co.] is buying new fare collection equipment, that is right, and even though a San Diego company is the best in the world, BART wants a waiver of the buy American laws so they can buy a machine and machinery from Germany. That is right.

They say the German machines are cheaper. Mr. Speaker, it is a downright stone-cold lie. On the long haul, the German equipment is more expensive than the machines made in San Diego.

I am urging the Federal Transit Administration to deny the waiver request. No wonder California is bankrupt, no jobs, when the bay area BART, like Bart Simpson, will buy machines from Germany and not better machines from San Diego workers.

Beam me up. You want to solve the deficit? Start buying some damn American-made goods.

#### STOP POLITICIZING THE FBI

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, for years Democrats leveled charges of improper political influence at the Department of Justice. In response, the Clinton White House implemented highly touted policies to put an end to the perceived problem. Now we learn that these policies were promptly ignored when an FBI official was summoned to the White House and pressured to rewrite an FBI statement to provide cover for White House officials involved in the travel office scandal.

Policies to prevent politicization of the Bureau call for White House requests for assistance to go through the Attorney General. However, Attorney General Reno's office was completely bypassed in this case. To her credit, Ms. Reno protested the decision, making her look, once again, like one of the few people in this administration with any common sense.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has too much serious work to do to be dragged into providing political cover for the kids at the White House. If White House officials wish to engage in cronyism, nepotism, and self dealing, then let them take the heat for it. But keep the FBI out of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is amateur hour at the White House.